

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/649,293	Applicant(s) COHEN, LAWRENCE T.	
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

All Participants:

 (1) George R. Evanisko.

 (2) Michael Verga.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 28 August 2006
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

37, 45

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: To incorporate in claims 37 and 45 the use of "electrode" after "any", so the claims are similar to allowable claim 29 (that reads over Fu and Shannon since Fu and Shannon teach that the physical separation of electrodes is constant) since between all/any electrodes (not just the claimed electrodes) on the array there must be a graduated spacing . In addition, "auditory" was added to claim 45 to clarify that the array is for the auditory system.